

APPLICANTS: SAGIV, Amir et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/086,632
FILED: March 4, 2002
Page 7

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1-9 and 14-17 have been amended. Claims 10-13 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to resubmission in a divisional or continuation application

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner contended that the term "reduce" is not defined in claims 12 and 13 and that the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree.

Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the cancellation of claims 12 and 13, the rejection of claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is now moot.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-11 and 14-18 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta et al. (US Patent No. 6,766,176).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of claims 1-11 and 14-18 in view of the remarks that follow.

As is well established, in order to successfully assert a prima facie case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art document that teaches every element and limitation of the claim or claims being rejected.

APPLICANTS: SAGIV, Amir et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/086,632
FILED: March 4, 2002
Page 8

Each of amended independent claims 1, 6, 14, and 17 recite, in paraphrase, storing a noise floor value of a chip; determining an approximated noise floor value by performing the following operations one or more times: counting a number of noise events in which a direct-current offset value of a chip is bigger than said noise floor value; and updating said noise floor value based on the number of said noise events. It is respectfully asserted that Gupta et al. does not teach or fairly suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of independent claims 1, 6, 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102§(e) in view of Gupta et al. be withdrawn.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 6, 14 and 17 are patentable, and thus allowable, over the prior art references on record and any combination thereof. In this regard, it is noted that the distinguishing features of independent claims 1, 6, 14, and 17, as discussed above, would not have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person skilled in the art, in view of Gupta et al., alone or in combination with any other cited references.

Claims 2-5 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1 and incorporate all the elements of this claim. Claims 7-9 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 6 and incorporate all the elements of this claim. Claims 15-16 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 14 and incorporate all the elements of this claim. Claim 18 depends directly from independent claim 17 and incorporates all the elements of this claim. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-5, 7-9, 15-16 and 18 are patentable, and thus allowable, at least for the reasons set forth above.

Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the cancellation of claims 12 and 13, the rejection of claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is now moot.

APPLICANTS: SAGIV, Amir et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/086,632
FILED: March 4, 2002
Page 9

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. Specifically, the Examiner contended that it was known at the time of invention to utilize firmware to save energy consumption and space.


Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the cancellation of claims 12, the rejection of claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is now moot.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,


Naim Shichan

Attorney/Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 56,248

Dated: January 3, 2006

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
10 Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 1001
New York, New York 10020
Tel: (212) 632-3480
Fax: (212) 632-3489